D. REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 17-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13-15, and 17-19 are currently amended. Claims 5, 12, 16, and 20 are currently canceled.

Claim Objections Overcome

The Office Action objects to claim 8 because of an informality. [Office Action, p. 2] In particular, the Office Actions states that "satisfaction is misspelled on line 6 or claim 8". Applicants amend claim 8 to correct the spelling of satisfaction. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

King does not anticipate the pending claims

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by King (US Publication 2004/0078711). [Office Action, p. 2] Claims 5, 12, 15, and 20 are currently cancelled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 17-19 under 35 USC 102(e) in view of the amendments to the claims. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987). Furthermore the reference must be an enabling disclosure of each and every element as set forth in the claim. *In re Hoecksma*, 158 USPQ 596, 600 (CCPA 1968); *In re LeGrive*, 133 USPQ 365, 372 (CCPA 1962). Because King does not teach each and every element of claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 17-19 or enable each and every element of these claims, these claims are not anticipated, the rejection should be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed.

Claims 1 and 8

Claim 1, which is similar in rejection and subject matter to claim 8, currently reads:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended): A data processing system ~~including processor and system memory~~, comprising:

a plurality [[set]] of field replaceable units (FRUs) each comprising a separate resource from among a plurality of resources comprising at least one processor, at least one system memory, at least one bus, and at least one adapter;

a plurality of logical partitions each virtually allocated a separate selection of the plurality of field replaceable units, each of the plurality of logical partitions running a separate instance of at least one operating system;

a plurality [[set]] of identify indicators wherein a separate ~~at least one of the~~ identify indicator[[s]] from among said plurality of identify indicators is associated with each ~~at least one~~ of the plurality of field replaceable units;

each of the plurality of separate instances of the at least one operating system among the plurality of logical partitions for controlling conditions under which each of the plurality of identify indicators allocated to the particular logical partition from among the plurality of logical partitions is turned off;

at least one global level controller separate from the plurality of logical partitions ~~means~~ for enabling a user to specify a condition under which an activated identify indicator from among the plurality of identify indicators is reset independent of which of the plurality of logical partitions the activated identify indicator is allocated to;

the at least one global level controller ~~means~~ for globally monitoring the plurality of resources of the system independent of allocations to the plurality of logical partitions to detect satisfaction of the condition and for deactivating the activated identify indicator in response thereto.

First, Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter is added through the amendments to claims 1 and 8 because the specification and figures teach each of the elements throughout. In particular, paragraphs 0015, 0022, and 0028 and Figure 1 teach a plurality of field replaceable units (FRUs) each comprising a separate resource from among a plurality of resources comprising at least one processor, at least one system memory, at least one bus, and at least one adapter, paragraphs 0016, 0021, 0024, 0025 and Figures 1 and 5 and teach a plurality of logical partitions each virtually allocated a separate selection of the plurality of field replaceable units, each of the plurality of logical partitions running a separate instance of at least one operating system, paragraphs 0022 and 0024 and Figure 1 teach a plurality of identify indicators

wherein a separate identify indicator is associated with each of the plurality of field replaceable units, paragraphs 0016, 0027, 0028 teach each of the plurality of separate instances of the at least one operating system among the plurality of logical partitions for controlling conditions under which each of the plurality of identify indicators allocated to the particular logical partition from among the plurality of logical partitions is turned off, paragraphs 0026 and 0028 and Figure 5 teach a hardware management console that is a global level controller for the element of at least one global level controller separate from the plurality of logical partitions for enabling a user to specify a condition under which an activated identify indicator from among the plurality of identify indicators is reset independent of which of the plurality of logical partitions the activated identify indicator is allocated to, and paragraphs 0025, 0029, and 0037 and Figure 5 teach a hypervisor that is a global level controller for the element of the at least one global level controller for globally monitoring the plurality of resources of the system independent of allocations to the plurality of logical partitions to detect satisfaction of the condition and for deactivating the activated identify indicator in response thereto.

Second, Applicants respectfully assert that King does not teach each and every element of claims 1 and 8 and therefore King does not anticipate claims 1 and 8.

In particular, as to the element of a plurality of field replaceable units (FRUs) each comprising a separate resource from among a plurality of resources comprising at least one processor, at least one system memory, at least one bus, and at least one adapter, Applicants note that King describes one example of an FRU is an information processing cartridge, where an information processing cartridge is operable as a server and includes all of a processor, a system memory, a bus system, and adapters. *King,* paragraphs 0048, 0052, 0125-0132. King does not teach or enable FRUs each with a separate one of the resources as described in the specification of the present invention and taught in claims 1 and 8. Thus, King does not teach the FRUs of claims 1 and 8.

As to the element of a plurality of logical partitions each virtually allocated a separate selection of the plurality of field replaceable units, each of the plurality of logical partitions running a separate instance of at least one operating system, Applicants respectfully note that King specifically describes each information processing

cartridge, which is described by King as a physical server unit and FRU, as running a separate instance of an operating system. *King*, paragraphs 0048, 0052, 0125-0132. In addition, Kings' physically separate, self-contained, server units, such as the server illustrated in Figure 11, do not teach or enable a logical partition of separate selections of the field replaceable units, which represent the individual components that when virtually allocated to a logical partition, operate as a separate system. Therefore, King does not teach or enable a plurality of logical partitions each virtually allocated a separate selection of the FRUs as taught in claims 1 and 8.

Further, as to the element of <u>a plurality of identify indicators wherein a separate identify indicator is associated with each of the plurality of field replaceable units</u>, Applicants note that the Office Action cites paragraph 0113, lines 3-11 as reading on the element of "a set of identify indicators wherein at least one of the identify indicators is associated with at least one of the field replaceable units." [Office Action, p. 2] Applicants note that paragraphs 0102 and 0113 of King and Figure 8 as a whole describe that for a set of up to 16 information processing cartridges, which are FRUs, two indicator boards are added at the front and rear of the system and also separately configured as FRUs. The indicator boards in King are not FRU level indicators, nor resource level indicators, but indicators for a system including the set of information processing cartridges. *King*, paragraph 0113. The LED's can be switched on by a user for locating the system of the set of information processing cartridges, indicating when the system is powered, or indicating when the system requires servicing. *King*, paragraph 0113. Therefore, clearly King does not teach or enable a plurality of identify indicators, which may include LEDs, where each identify indicator is associated with one of the FRUs as taught in claims 1 and 8.

In addition, as to the elements of <u>each of the plurality of separate instances of the at least one operating system among the plurality of logical partitions for controlling conditions under which each of the plurality of identify indicators allocated to the particular logical partition from among the plurality of logical partitions is turned off</u> , <u>at least one global level controller separate from the plurality of logical partitions for enabling a user to specify a condition under which an activated identify indicator from</u>

among the plurality of identify indicators is reset independent of which of the plurality of logical partitions the activated identify indicator is allocated to, and the at least one global level controller for globally monitoring the plurality of resources of the system independent of allocations to the plurality of logical partitions to detect satisfaction of the condition and for deactivating the activated identify indicator in response thereto, Applicants note that the Office Action cites paragraph 0239, lines 1-3 as reading on the element of "means for enabling a user to specify a condition under which an activated identify indicator is reset" and cites paragraph 0243 as reading on the element of "means for monitoring the system to detect satisfaction of the condition and for deactivating the identify indicator in response thereto." [Office Action, p. 2] Applicants note that during the interview, the Examiner also cited paragraph 0240 as reading on the previously claimed elements. Paragraph 0234 of King, not cited in the Office Action, describes a system monitoring application that is able to monitor the operating system functionality of each of the systems of information processing cartridges, referred to as blades. Paragraph 0239 of King describes that the monitor application

> "can monitor the health of the domains is to allow user configurable rules to be enabled for some or all domains. This allows a user to configure rules to monitor the specific application deployed on that domain"

and paragraph 0240 of King describes,

> "an example of a user configurable rule for web server blades, for example, may be to check the web server health. This can involve sending a web page request to the web server and monitoring the response time."

Paragraph 0243 of King describes that "when the service processor (which can monitor the domain initialization or can receive a message indicating that the domain has initialized) determines that the domain is active, the service processor applies rules from the service processor memory to the newly initiated domain." Applicants respectfully assert that regardless of any applicability of King's description of applying rules to blades to determine the health of an application running on a blade and a service processor determining whether a domain is active, King does not teach or enable both

of the operating systems within the logical partitions for controlling partition based conditions for turning off identify indicator associated with the resources of the partition AND a global level controller separate from the logical partitions for enabling a user to specify the conditions under which an activated identify indicator is reset independent of logical partition and for monitoring the resources of the system independent of allocations to logical partitions to detect the user specified condition and deactivate the activated identity indicator. Because King does not teach both partition level control of identify indicators associated with resources allocated to a logical partition and global control of identify indicator associated with resources regardless of the logical partition allocation of the resources, King does not teach each and every element of claims 1 and 8.

Because King does not teach each and every element of claims 1 and 8, King does not anticipate claims 1 and 8 under 35 USC 102(e) and the claims should be allowed.

Claims 2-4, 6-11 and 13-14

As to claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-14, Applicants respectfully assert that because claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-14 are dependent upon allowable claims 1 and 8, then claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-14 are also allowable by virtue of the dependency. In addition, Applicants note that claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are amended in order to maintain antecedent basis in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 8.

In particular, with regards to claims 3 and 10, claim 3 currently reads:

Claim 3/10 (Currently Amended): The system of claim 2, wherein the at least one global level controller means for globally monitoring the plurality of resources of the system comprise means for polling the serial number of the FRU associated with the activated identity indicator to determine when the FRU has been replaced.

Applicants respectfully note that the specification describes a hypervisor, which is a global level controller for polling the serial number of the FRU associated with the activated identity indicator to determine when the FRU has been replaced in paragraph 0029 of the specification. Applicants note that the Office Action previously rejected

claims 3 and 10 under paragraph 0133 and paragraph 0165, lines 6-7. As previously noted in the interview summary, the Examiner explained that paragraph 0165 describes a serial number in an EEPROM and to paragraph 0133 describes accessing boot information from the EEPROM. Applicants respectfully note that paragraph 0133 describes that within the information processing cartridge, which King teaches is a functioning server and King describes as an FRU, an EEPROM may include the boot information for the FRU. As previously noted King's FRU does not teach an FRU of the present invention. Further, as previously noted, King's LED's identify the status of a system of multiple cartridges in general, not the status of a particular resource, such as a processor. Therefore, King also does not teach or enable a global level controller for monitoring for serial number changes at a resource level to determine when the FRU comprising the resource is replaced.

Claims 15 and 17-19

Claim 15 is amended to include method elements similar to the system elements taught in claim 1. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 17-19 are amended to maintain antecedent basis in view of the amendments to claim 15. In addition, claims 17-19, as dependent claims of allowable claim 15, are also allowable virtue of the dependency. The elements in claim 17 are similar to the elements in dependent claims 2 and 9. The elements in claim 18 are similar to the elements in dependent claims 3 and 10 and claim 18 is also allowable for the same reasons that claims 3 and 10 are also independently allowable as not anticipated by King. The elements in claim 19 are similar to the elements in claims 6 and 13.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,
By /Amy J. Pattillo, Reg. No. 46,983/
    AMY J. PATTILLO
    Registration No. 46,983
    P.O. BOX 161327
    AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716
    ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
    Telephone: 512-402-9820
    Facsimile: 512-306-0417